

Comment on “*c*-axis Josephson tunneling in $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -wave superconductors”

G. B. Arnold*, R. A. Klemm†, W. Körner‡, K. Scharnberg‡

*Physics Department, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

†Max-Planck-Institut für Physik komplexer Systeme, Nöthnitzer Str. 38, D-01187 Dresden, Germany

‡I. Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Hamburg, Jungiusstr. 9, D-05535 Hamburg, Germany

Recently, Maki and Haas (MH) presented an expression, Eq. (3), for the critical current I_c for coherent *c*-axis tunneling across the interface between identical $d_{x^2-y^2}$ -wave superconductors twisted a relative angle α about the *c*-axis.¹ They implied that Eq. (3) was valid to all orders in the *c*-axis tunneling probability $t_\perp$, accounting for “the effects of Andreev reflections at the grain boundary”.¹ However, they made many qualitative and quantitative errors, which invalidate their conclusions.

The errors are present in their Eq. (3). MH state that this result is obtained “by applying the Ambegaokar-Baratoff formalism”, but a derivation is neither given nor cited. The result of Ambegaokar and Baratoff (AB) is based on the tunneling Hamiltonian approximation,² valid to lowest order in $t_\perp$, while the MH result clearly involves higher orders in $t_\perp$. Therefore, we first take this equation at face value and examine its consequences.

MH assumed a cylindrical, two-dimensional Fermi surface in each superconductor adjacent to the interface, in contrast to the experimental tight-binding Fermi surface of $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_{8+\delta}$ (Bi2212). In the s-wave limit, the MH Eq. (3) for I_c is independent of $t_\perp$, which is clearly unphysical. Even if Eq. (3) were to apply for $I_c R/e$, it is wrong, because exact calculations for s-wave superconductors have shown that $I_c R/e$ for an *SIS* junction depends upon $t_\perp$.³ At low temperature T , $I_c R/e$ increases from the AB value to twice that value as $t_\perp$ increases from 0 to unity. Only as $T \rightarrow T_c$ does $I_c R/e$ become independent of $t_\perp$.

In addition, the MH result disagrees with an exact calculation of I_c for tunneling between *SIS* layered superconductors obtained by Arnold and Klemm (AK),⁴ given in their Eq. (18). Comparing the MH Eq. (3) with the AK Eq. (18), we identify many significant differences. The exact AK Eq. (18) contains the phase difference $\delta\phi$ across the tunnel barrier in the coefficient of each order in $t_\perp$, and I_c is optimized for each α by setting $\delta\phi = \delta\phi^* < \pi/2$. Each Andreev reflection should also involve $\delta\phi$, but the MH Eq. (3) evidently set $\delta\phi^* = \pi/2$. The MH gap Δ_0 is evidently independent of T . This disagrees with the AB limit. In the d-wave case, as $t_\perp \rightarrow 0$, the MH result also disagrees with the d-wave AB limit.

Andreev reflections at the interface could only arise if it were an *SNS* junction. It would then be much stronger than the intrinsic interplanar couplings in the single crystals, which are generally agreed to be of the *SIS* type. However, MH neglected altogether the intrinsic tunneling between the junctions in the layered superconducting half-spaces adjacent to the interface.⁴ Furthermore, the

$t_\perp(\mathbf{k})$ employed by MH in their Eq. (6) is inappropriate for the cylindrical Fermi surface they employed.¹ As shown previously,^{4,5} tight-binding Fermi surfaces of layered superconductors such as Bi2212 misoriented relative to each other also introduce a strong α dependence of I_c for coherent tunneling, even in the s-wave case, especially with a $t_\perp(\mathbf{k})$ analogous to that used in Eq. (6) of MH.⁴

The I_c s observed by Li *et al.* are equal to those observed in single crystals,⁶ which are not “small”, as claimed by MH. Li *et al.* fed the *c*-axis current into the top of the crystal. We have studied this case theoretically,⁸ and find that within a few layers from the current leads, the current becomes uniform over the crystal surface on the scale of the *c*-axis penetration depth, $\lambda_c > 100\mu\text{m}$. However, in the whisker experiment of Takano *et al.*,⁷ the current was fed in from the edge, producing current inhomogeneities on the scale of the Josephson penetration depth, $\approx 2 - 3\mu\text{m}$.⁸

Finally, we note that the α dependence of I_c observed in the experiments of Takano *et al.* may have an extrinsic origin, due to systematic variations with α of the $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{Ca}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{10+\delta}$ mixture and additional insulating barrier thicknesses near the cross-whisker interface.^{9,10}

¹ K. Maki and S. Haas, Phys. Rev. B **67**, 020510 (2003).

² V. Ambegaokar and A. Baratoff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 456 (1963); **11**, 104 (1963).

³ Gerald B. Arnold, J. Low Temp. Phys. **59**, 143 (1985).

⁴ G. B. Arnold and R. A. Klemm, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 661 (2000).

⁵ A. Bille, R. A. Klemm, K. Scharnberg, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 174507 (2001).

⁶ Q. Li, Y. N. Tsay, M. Suenaga, R. A. Klemm, G. D. Gu, and N. Koshizuka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4160 (1999).

⁷ Y. Takano, T. Hatano, A. Fukuyo, A. Ishii, M. Ohmori, S. Arisawa, K. Togano, and M. Tachiki, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 140513 (2002).

⁸ W. Körner, Diplomarbeit, Universität Hamburg, (2002).

⁹ R. A. Klemm, Phys. Rev. B **67**, xxxx (2003), to be published.

¹⁰ Y. Takano, T. Hatano, A. Fukuyo, M. Ohmori, P. Ahmet, T. Naruke, K. Nakajima, T. Chikyow, K. Ishii, S. Arisawa, K. Togano, and M. Tachiki, Sing. J. Phys. **18**, 67 (2002).